



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,367	02/26/2004	Minoru Nakajima	Q79579	3416
23373	7590	03/01/2007	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			LONEY, DONALD J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/01/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/786,367	NAKAJIMA, MINORU	
	Examiner Donald Loney	Art Unit 1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7,9 and 37-39 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 7,9 and 37-39 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                                         | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 1772

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Inventorship*

1. In view of the papers filed December 6, 2006, the inventorship in this nonprovisional application has been changed by the deletion of Isei SANOMIYA.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of Office records to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Corson (2512310).

Corson discloses a thermoplastic layer comprising embossments 12,13 on both sides thereof. The embossments are in the form concave portions of a trough-like geometry 10, 13a and convex portions of a plateau-forming top surface 12, 13 as shown in figures 1-3. The plateau-forming top surface contains fine concave and convex portions shown as minute v-shaped grooves. Refer to figures 1-3. The rubber would at least be capable of bonding to a glass sheet under heat and pressure applied thereto.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

Art Unit: 1772

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 9 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corson.

The primary reference teaches the invention substantially as recited except for the specific surface roughness of the plateau-forming top surface and embossments, and width of the top surface of the plateau. See the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection above.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Corson to form the top surface and embossments of the roughness as recited motivated by the fact Corson already discloses the surfaces as rough due to its topography and one would form them as rough as desired for a particular application (i.e. degree of slipperiness of the mat). Regarding claim 39, it would be obvious to form the plateau of the percent width of the pitch of the embossment motivated by the fact Corson already teaches the side walls of the embossments as sloped, therefore, the plateau would be less than 100% of the pitch (which would be when the side walls are perpendicular to the X- axis) and this would only involve a mere change in shape and/or size which is generally within ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.04IV.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed December 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the mat of Corson would not be capable of bonding to a glass sheet. However, as indicated above the examiner deems that rubber would at least be capable of bonding to a glass sheet under heat and pressure applied thereto. In addition, the limitation of "capable of contact bonding to a glass sheet" can be met since the rubber sheet could be adhesively bonded to the glass sheet which also reads upon the added functional recitations recited by the applicant. The added

Art Unit: 1772

functional language does not provide a structurally distinguishing feature from the prior art. The applicant argues that the particular roughness of claims 9, 37 and 38 along with the characteristics specified in claim 39 would not be obvious to one skilled in the art. However, as indicated above it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Corson to form the top surface and embossments of the roughness as recited motivated by the fact Corson already discloses the surfaces as rough due to its topography and one would form them as rough as desired for a particular application (i.e. degree of slipperiness of the mat). Regarding claim 39, it would be obvious to form the plateau of the percent width of the pitch of the embossment motivated by the fact Corson already teaches the side walls of the embossments as sloped, therefore, the plateau would be less than 100% of the pitch (which would be when the side walls are perpendicular to the X- axis) and this would only involve a mere change in shape and/or size which is generally within ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.04IV.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald Loney whose telephone number is (571) 272-1493. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs and Fri. 8AM-4PM, flex schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/786,367

Art Unit: 1772

Page 7

*Donald J. Loney*

Donald Loney  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1772

DJL:D.Loney  
02/26/07